

Remarks/Arguments

Claim 8 and 21-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki, U.S. 4,999,709. Claims 2-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Berman, U.S. Patent No. 5,610,665. Claims 9 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Birks et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,373,530.

By this amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 21 and 23, which were the only independent claims pending in this application and has added new independent claim 29. Applicant respectfully submits that Yamazaki, alone or in combination with Berman and Birks et al. does not teach or suggest a method of displaying video as recited in claim 29 which comprises the steps of providing a stream of live video images from a camera; overlaying textual information on top of the stream of live video images in a manner to minimize blockage of the stream of live video images by the overlaid textual information; displaying the stream of live video images and overlaid textual information on the screen of a display; and automatically moving the overlaid textual information periodically without altering the overlaid textual information so that the overlaid textual information is continuously available on the screen, without moving the stream of live video images, without moving the overlaid textual information off of the screen, and with minimum blockage of the stream of live video images by the overlaid textual information.

The teachings of Yamazaki are summarized in its abstract which states as follows:

“Apparatus for superimposing graphic title image signals onto an input video signal to produce a video picture having graphics, such as title images, superimposed thereon. Graphic title image data is written into a memory and subsequently is read out under the control of an address generator whose read-out

addresses are shifted at a given repetition rate to change the positioning of the graphic title image data relative to the video signal, thereby producing a scrolling effect of the graphics across an image plane.”

The movement of the superimposed graphic title image video signals of Yamazaki is explained in detail at column 13, lines 32-47, which states as follows:

“In accordance with the present invention, the graphic title image signals superposed onto the picked up video signals (referred to as the input video signal) may be scrolled in the horizontal and vertical direction. That is, the relative position of the graphic title image signals superposed onto the input video signal may be shifted such that when a video picture thereof is displayed, the graphic material derived from the graphic title image signals appears to shift or scroll, horizontally and vertically.”

The shifting or scrolling taught by Yamazaki is clearly shown in Figs. 8 and 9 where the effective image moves across the screen and can cover the majority of the screen.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yamazaki does not teach or suggest overlaying textual information on top of the stream of live video images in a manner to minimize blockage of the stream of live video images by the overlaid textual information. Furthermore, Yamazaki does not teach or suggest moving the textual information periodically without altering the overlaid textual information so that the overlaid textual information is continuously available on the screen. Yamazaki's method clearly scrolls the overlaid information across the screen with the amount of overlaid information available on the screen varying depending on the stage of scrolling. In addition, Yamazaki does not move the overlaid textual information with minimum blockage of the stream of live video images by the overlaid textual information. The degree that the overlaid textual information can block the underlying video in Yamazaki is shown very clearly in Figures 8 and 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamazaki does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in claim 29.

Berman does not teach or suggest any of the features of Applicant's invention that are missing from Yamazaki. Berman does not teach overlaying textual information on top of the stream of live video images in a manner to minimize blockage to the stream of live video images by the overlaid textual information. Rather, Berman at lines 6-11 of the Abstract teaches "A joystick input device allows the television viewer to select from a library of superimposed images and to move the images to any location over the television scene. The viewer may continue to move the superimposed images over the television scene to set up and maintain humorous or other expressive effects." Accordingly, it can be seen that Berman teaches putting the superimposed images anywhere on the television scene including over the television scene to maintain humorous or other expressive effects, thereby blocking the stream of live video images rather than minimizing the blockage. In addition, Berman does not teach or suggest "moving the overlaid textual information periodically without altering the overlaid textual information so that the overlaid textual information is continuously available on the screen" as recited in Applicant's claim 29. In fact, at lines 10 and 11 of Berman's Abstract, it is stated "to set up and maintain humorous or other expressive effects (emphasis added)." and at column 4, lines 13-15, Berman teaches "Overlay images may be moved off screen in one direction and then reenter the screen from another direction to give an added dimension of playfulness." Accordingly, Yamazaki in combination with Berman does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in claim 29.

Adding Birks et al. in combination with Yamazaki alone or with Berman still does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Birks et al. is directed to inserting a logo, such as a television channel logo, into a compressed video stream so that it is displayed on a viewer's television set in a corner of the video display so that when viewers "channel surf" they can immediately know what channel is being viewed. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no

teaching or suggestion that Birks et al. should be combined or that it could be combined with Yamazaki, which pertains to an apparatus for inserting title pictures and then scrolling them across the screen horizontally or vertically. Assuming for the sake of argument that Birks et al. could be combined with Yamazaki, Birks et al. merely teaches the insertion of a logo into a compressed video stream so that the resultant combination would at best be a system in which the logo would scroll across the screen and does not provide the features missing from Yamazaki alone or in combination with Berman. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamazaki in combination with Birks et al. or in combination with Birks et al. and Berman does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in claim 29.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 2, 2006



Paul T. Kashimba, Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,180
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
500 East Broward Boulevard, Suite 1400
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33394-3076
Direct: (954) 712-1465
Tel: (954) 462-2000
Fax: (954) 523-1722
Email: pkashimba@gunster.com

FTL 298472.1

16960.00125
Appl. No. 09/844,046
Amendment filed 3/2/2006